

ADMIRAL SCHLEY DEFENDS HIMSELF

Resents Charges Recently
Made Against Him.

SAMPSON WAS UNGENEROUS

In All That He Did as Second in Command of the North Atlantic Squadron He Obeyed Orders From His Superiors—A Dispatch From Sampson Withheld From Publicity—Location of Cervera's Fleet—Summary of Facts.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.)

Washington, D. C., February 20.—Rear-Admiral W. S. Schley, having been granted permission to answer the charges made against him in the communication recently sent to the Senate to-day handed to the Committee on Naval Affairs his statement, in which he disclaims any purpose of controversy with the Navy Department. The letter of the Department, he says, so far as it relates to him, can be summarized under the following heads:

"The delay of Cienfuegos; the alleged slow progress toward Santiago de Cuba from Cienfuegos; the retrograde movements on the 26th and 27th of May; the battle of Santiago, and the destruction of Cervera's fleet."

The Admiral says his orders from Sampson on May 19th were to blockade Cienfuegos, which he proceeded to do. On his arrival he sent Commander McCalla, of the Marblehead, ashore to establish relations with the insurgents, the result of which was made known to him at 3:30 on May 24th. Then for the first time he learned definitely that the Spanish fleet was not at Cienfuegos. Within two hours he started for Santiago.

ACTED UNDER ORDERS. "What possible ground of criticism," he says, "adverse to me there can be in all this, I do not see. I was on the spot acting under orders which gave me entire discretion, and yet I am held with the responsibility of going to Santiago, only after I was satisfied that the fleet was not at Cienfuegos."

He quoted from the dispatch of Sampson of May 20th, in which the latter says Schley should "hold his fleet off Cienfuegos. If the Spanish ships have put into Santiago, they must come either to Havana or Cienfuegos to deliver the munitions of war which they are said to bring for use in Cuba. I am, therefore, of the opinion that the best chance to capture these ships will be to hold the waters off Cienfuegos and Havana, with the force we can muster. If later it should develop that these vessels are at Santiago, we can then assemble off that port, the ships best suited for the purpose, and completely blockade it. Until we then receive more positive information we shall continue to hold Havana and Cienfuegos."

WITHHELD FROM PUBLICITY.

Admiral Schley adds: "This letter is not printed either in the appendix or executive document C, but I received it on the 23d, and it shows that I was expected to hold my squadron off Cienfuegos."

As to slow progress toward Santiago on account of the delay, he states that there was a part of the force which Admiral Sampson and sent to him to send him, and he had no right to abandon her.

Speaking of "the retrograde movements," which the Secretary, adapting the language of Admiral Sampson, characterizes as reprehensible conduct, Admiral Schley says that in 42 years' service "never was such language used to characterize conduct of mine, and I see no reason for it now."

He adds:

LOCATION OF CERVERA'S FLEET. "Acting in accordance with my best judgment, in view of the circumstances, without certain knowledge of the whereabouts of that Spanish fleet, after having been informed by the scouts commanded by such officers as Sigbee, J. L. and Vixen, that although they had been off Santiago for a week, they had seen nothing of it, and knew nothing of its whereabouts, since it had left Curacao, after having been assured by Sigbee, that he did not believe it was in Santiago, and by the emphatic declaration of the pilot Nunez, and knowing that as the sea and weather then were, it would be impossible to coal my squadron off the port, I deemed it best to take the action I did, the final result of which was the location of the enemy's fleet in Santiago harbor."

As to the battle of Santiago, Admiral Schley says the facts of that contest speak for themselves. He quotes from his official report to Sampson, in which he congratulated the commander of the squadron, and said the "victory seems big enough for all of us."

CONTRAST WITH SAMPSON ASKED. He asks the committee to contrast his reports to those of Sampson, containing references to himself, and continues:

"As to all this criticism of my course prior to the discovery by me on May 23d of Cervera's fleet, whether from Admiral Sampson or the Department, none of it has ever been made by either to me; and I never heard of a word from any one, until after the battle with that fleet, although more than five weeks had passed since the alleged 'reprehensible conduct' had occurred."

SUMMARY OF FACTS.

Admiral Schley then submits a long detailed statement of the facts, he summarized in the foregoing, which is in reply to a request by Chairman Hale, of the Naval Committee:

"The commanding officer of the Harvard reported that he did not have coal enough to reach any home base and could not steam beyond twenty-four or thirty hours, which, the Admiral says, forced him to send the Harvard to Kingston; the Yale and Minneapolis

could reach Key West, and the St. Paul could remain at most off the port for but two days. The Brooklyn, Iowa and Massachusetts were fairly well off with coal, but the Texas, Marblehead and Vixen were considerably reduced. The projecting sponson of the Texas and Marblehead made it dangerous to coal them alongside the collier with any swell on the open sea.

"It was this situation," says the statement, "coupled with the conclusion that the Spanish squadron might have touched and then moved west, as reported at Cienfuegos, and reinforced by the fact that Sigbee had not seen them, and that the pilot Nunez was strongly impressed with the doubt that this squadron could enter the port, which occasioned my telegram of May 27th."

A DECISIVE CONFLICT ORDERED. Captain Sigbee is quoted as confirming the opinion as to the difficulty of coaling off Santiago. He gives the details of the absolute location of the Spanish squadron inside of the harbor on May 29, which discovery was the Admiral says, the result of a determination to satisfy himself fully before leaving for the west. On the 31st he made a reconnaissance to develop the enemy's position and incidentally to injure or destroy, if possible, the Colon moored well up in the harbor.

Admiral Schley quotes the department's dispatch of May 29 in these words:

"The department looks to you to ascertain the fact of the presence of the enemy, and that the enemy, if in the harbor at Santiago, does not leave without decisive action." Commenting on this the Admiral says:

"In obedience to the above order and without any further order or instruction from any one, I did ascertain the fact that the enemy was at Santiago and the enemy did not leave without a decisive conflict."

CLOTHED WITH RESPONSIBILITY. Detailing the events connected with the battle of July 3d, he says that at 8:45 of that day Admiral Sampson made signal from his flagship, "Disregard movements of the Commander-in-Chief," and steamed eastward to Sponcy. "This," says Admiral Schley, "left me, the senior officer present, and necessarily clothed me with the responsibility of the command." Continuing, he declares that when the enemy's vessels came out of the harbor signal was made from the Brooklyn (his flagship) to the fleet to "clear ship for action." Then followed the signal "close action," and this by the signal, "the enemy escaping to westward." Following the appearance of the Spanish fleet there was a general inward movement of the American vessels, closing in and engaging it.

MOVEMENTS OF THE VESSELS. Explaining the movements of the vessels of both fleets he says the Spanish fleet was coming westward under high speed and "changing course more to westward, brought the Brooklyn heading eastward to meet it into a position where she would have blanketed the fire of the eastern vessels of our force now changing their courses to the westward and between them and the Spanish vessels."

"Instant decision," he continues, "was therefore necessary to avoid interfering in any way or cutting off any of the fire of our vessels, as would have occurred if she had turned toward the Spanish fleet now approaching the Brooklyn. Turning outward left the enemy's ships unmasked by the Brooklyn and exposed them to the concentrated fire of our squadron. The result of this maneuver was that in thirty minutes from the opening of the combat four of the enemy's vessels were on fire and riddled with projectiles."

SAMPSON'S LATE ARRIVAL.

At the final capture of the Colon at 1:15 p. m. the Brooklyn was nearest, the Oregon next and then the Texas and Vixen. The New York arrived at 2:23 p. m. and the commander-in-chief assumed command of the squadron. Signals were made from the Brooklyn to the squadron until all signal halyards were shot away, and then by the Myers army code.

DECIDING FEATURE OF COMBAT.

In conclusion, Admiral Schley contends that the turn of the Brooklyn in the battle of the 3d was "the crucial and deciding feature of the combat and of decided advantage."

Furthermore, he says it is a mistake to say that the vessel's distance from the enemy was increased to the extent of 800 yards, and adds:

"Though this may not be of record, it is a fact nevertheless." He cites the fact that the charts of the Board of Navigators shows that the Brooklyn was the nearest when it emerged from the harbor, nearest at every stage of the battle and nearest the Colon when it surrendered, and gives many confirmatory details of his flagship's active and effective participation in the battle.

He says he made no report of his maneuver in his report of the battle, as its effect upon the battle was never a question with him. His last paragraph reads:

SAMPSON CONTRADICTS HIMSELF. "On May 31 I received a telegram from the commander-in-chief congratulating me on my success in locating and blockading the enemy's fleet at Santiago. If it was worthy of commendation at that time I am at a loss to understand how it could have grown into 'reprehensible conduct,' as suggested by Admiral Sampson in his letter of July 10, 1898, some six weeks later."

New Secretary of the Interior.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.) Washington, Feb. 20.—Mr. Ethan Allen Hitchcock, of Missouri, recently United States Ambassador to Russia, to-day took the prescribed oath and enters upon his duties as Secretary of the Interior.

OTHER TELEGRAPH PAGE 6.

CLASSIFICATION OF NEWS.

BY DEPARTMENTS.

Telegraph News—Page 1.
Local News—Pages 2, 3, 5 and 6.
Editorial—Page 4.
Virginia News—Pages 8 and 9.
North Carolina News—Page 11.
Portsmouth News—Pages 10 and 11.
Berkley News—Page 6.
Markets—Page 12.
Shipping—Page 12.

COMPENSATION FOR THE PHILIPPINES

Lively Debate in the House
of Representatives.

BROWN-SWANSON CONTEST

Passage of Bill to Pay Spain Twenty Millions of Dollars—Mr. Wheeler, of Kentucky, Pays His Respects to the Administration—Postal Matters Considered in the Senate—Public Building For Selma.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.)

Washington, Feb. 20.—This was suspension day in the House. Some minor business was transacted by unanimous consent.

The Senate amendments to a number of private pension bills were adopted. Mr. Grow (Rep., of Pennsylvania) asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill to pay the heirs of Samuel Tewksbury, of Scranton, Pa., \$5,697 for a war claim, and when consent was refused the Speaker recognized him to move its passage, under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Maddox (Dem., of Georgia) opposed the bill on the ground that it was an unjust discrimination against a similar class of claims in the House. The bill was defeated 128 to 77, two-thirds not having voted in the affirmative.

EXTENSION OF MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. Loud (Rep., of California) moved the passage under suspension of the rules of the Senate bill to extend the terms of the mail service. The bill is to legalize the use of the return envelope and postal cards of the United States Economic Postage Association. This bill was defeated 125 to 97, two-thirds having again failed to vote to suspend the rules.

Thursday was set aside for the consideration of District of Columbia business subject to appropriation bills and the contested election of Brown vs. Swanson, which Mr. Crumpacker (Rep., of Indiana) gave notice he would again call up on that day.

STATE WAR CLAIMS. Mr. Mahon (Rep., of Pennsylvania) moved the passage under suspension of the Senate bill to reimburse Governors of States for expenses incurred by them in the organization of volunteers for service in the war with Spain.

Mr. Mahon said there were claims from the various States for this work, aggregating over \$3,000,000. Under the existing law only \$100,000 of these claims had been liquidated. The passage of this act was necessary for the settlement of the remainder. The House amendment, he said, would compel the Governors of the States to produce detailed vouchers and the reimbursement would be made through the government's accounting office.

The bill was passed, 155 to 15.

PAYMENT FOR PHILIPPINES.

Mr. Cannon, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was then recognized and by the direction of his committee, moved the passage, under suspension of the rules, of the bill for the payment of \$20,000,000 to Spain.

Mr. Dockery (Democrat, Missouri) asked unanimous consent to offer an amendment declaratory of the policy of the United States relative to the Philippines.

"Regular order," "regular order," shouted a dozen members on the Republican side.

"By direction of the Appropriations Committee," said Mr. Cannon, "I am directed to decline to accept that amendment. I could not if I would, and I would not if I could."

Mr. Wheeler (Democrat, Kentucky) demanded a second, which was ordered, 167 to 11.

This permitted 20 minutes for debate on each side. Mr. Cannon called attention to the fact that a few days ago, when the appropriation was stricken from the Sundry Civil bill, he had predicted that a way would be found within the rules to pass it. In his opinion nine-tenths of the members of the House favored it.

Mr. Dockery again asked unanimous consent for the consideration of his amendment, which, he said, was a combination of the McNary and Bacon resolutions. Again Mr. Cannon objected.

Mr. Clayton (Democrat, Alabama) said he did not think the President and the Peace Commissioners had been wise in insisting upon the cession of the Philippines, but since the treaty was concluded, he had believed there was but one thing to do—ratify the treaty (Republican applause).

WRONG AND INFAMOUS.

Mr. Wheeler, Democrat, of Kentucky, upon whose objection the appropriation went out of the sundry civil bill, declared he would vote against it with great pleasure. He was opposed to it because he believed it wrong in principle and infamous in execution. He was not afraid of giving offense to some effete and decaying monarchy of the old world. He declared the Administration was a soldier of fortune. It lacked the nerve and pluck to declare its purpose. Meawber-like, it was waiting for something to turn up. The war begun for humanity had degenerated into a war of bloody extermination, that would disgrace the pages of history. Mr. Wheeler criticized the methods of the Appropriations Committee and in conclusion declared he would stand by what he believed to be right.

Mr. Cannon concluded the debate with a brief speech, emphasizing the idleness of a declaration of policy at this time, when our troops were fighting to preserve order. When the authority of the United States was acknowledged, then with regard to our own self-respect, having in mind our own best interests, as well as those of the Philippines, we could decide what to do. The vote was then taken by yeas and noes upon the demand of Mr. Wheeler. The bill was passed—219 to 34.

EMBALMED BEEF NOW ON TRIAL

The Miles Court of Inquiry
Begins Work.

COMMANDING GENERAL HEARD

He Informs His Interrogators Why He Did Not Report to the Commissary General—Does Not Consider Canned Beef Meat—Other Officers Testify That Refrigerator Beef Was Fairly Good, but the Canned Article Was Worthless.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.)

Washington, D. C., February 20.—The Miles court of inquiry to-day made a good start on its work. The court was comfortably quartered in the old meeting room of the War Investigating Commission, in the Lemon building, with accommodations for representatives of the press associations and the local papers. Calls of ceremony on the President and the general commanding the army occupied a large part of the forenoon, and immediately thereafter General Nelson A. Miles appeared as the first witness.

He and three other army officers summoned as witnesses were examined and disposed of before the court closed its session, at 3 o'clock.

A CONTRAST.

General Miles appeared in fatigue uniform, rather striking in contrast with the display of scarfs, buttons and buttons of the full dress uniforms of the court. He submitted to the questioning of Colonel Davis, recorder of the court, with equanimity, except for a flash of mingled indignation and irony when he informed the recorder that he was not compelled to "report" to the Commissary General of the Army. This was in reply to a question as to whether or not he had reported to the Commissary Department the fact that complaints had been made to him as to the quality of meat being issued to the troops. An instant later General Miles resumed his cool and carefully considered replies to the inquiries of the court.

MILES IS SLOW AND CAREFUL.

General Miles was very slow and careful in his replies to the recorder's questions on this point. He called attention to the fact that in both instances he was credited in the interviews with refusing to answer certain questions, and insisted that these refusals should be given due weight in considering the questions to which he did reply. He said in the case of the interview of February 1 that he had a letter from the man who wrote the story offering to swear that General Miles had refused to be interviewed, and that the whole story was made up in the office from the writer's general knowledge of the facts. Notwithstanding this, when his final answer was asked as to the authenticity of the interview, General Miles did not specifically deny it, but merely said that it did not quite fairly represent his own opinion in the case. The same qualified denial as to the Journal interview of December 23 was made, leaving the witness in a quandary as to assuming any responsibility for the newspaper statements, but tacitly admitting that there was a good deal in them with which he agreed.

THE TREND OF QUESTIONS.

The trend of questions put to the other witnesses of the day indicated that so long as they agreed with General Miles as to the quality of the meat furnished the troops in the field, the only criticism of their position the court had to make was why they had not taken some official steps to have the matter remedied. In every instance the reply was that the circumstances in which the army was placed in a sickly foreign country, with a large amount of fighting and a great scarcity of transportation on hand, precluded the possibility of any such action. In each the question was pushed no further on this line.

AN ERRONEOUS INTERVIEW.

General Miles during his testimony as to the Herald interview, pointed out that the interview was erroneous in that where it represented him to have said that he had overwhelming evidence that the refrigerated beef was treated with chemicals, the fact was that his only evidence was what was contained in the reports of officers and statements of men who claimed that the beef had the odor of an embalmed body; that they had seen fluid injected into beef, and other indications of chemical treatment.

Colonel Davis, recurring to the statement of General Miles before the War Commission, asked him what his idea as to the beef supply for the army was when war broke out.

USAGE OF A CENTURY IGNORED.

Replying, General Miles said while his attention was occupied with weightier matters of mobilization and of equipment of troops, he felt confident that the usage of an hundred years would be followed, and cattle herds would be shipped to the army in the tropics and killed there, just as they had been through the South during the Civil war. In Arizona, Texas and in Mexico, where it was so hot that a soldier could not sit upon the rocks, he understood Cuba and Porto Rico were excellent grass countries, and cattle could be shipped and kept in prime condition. He reviewed his action in cabling the Department to send no more refrigerated beef to Porto Rico while he was there, finding it possible to use beef on the hoof.

STILL SUPPLYING EMBALMED BEEF.

General Miles said that he understood that our troops in Porto Rico were still being supplied with a form of refrigerated beef, although the coun-

try was as good a grass country as in any in the world, and the cattle there were plentiful.

"Do you think," continued Colonel Davis, "that the native beef would keep as well as the refrigerated beef in the absence of cooling apparatus on shore?"

"I am quite sure it would, unless the refrigerated beef was chemically treated with preservatives. If it was treated so as to keep for 72 hours after coming out of the coolers, of course it had the advantage of the native beef so far as keeping goes."

THE FIRST INQUIRY.

General Miles said the first complaints on the canned roast beef he heard at Tampa from some of the Rough Riders, and then again aboard the Yale, when the men declared they could not eat it. Again he heard complaints of it in the trenches at Santiago. What finally drew his attention seriously to the matter was the reports of officers that the whole Fifth corps was weak and prostrated. This was in August, when the question of a parade through New York was broached. General Bates at that time reported that only about one-fifth of the men at Montauk Point were in condition to march through New York. General Miles said this seemed to him remarkable, as there was no yellow fever at the Point, and he thought the men certainly ought to be over their malaria. He, therefore, ordered an inquiry into the beef about which there had been so much complaint.

"Did you report this matter at the time to the Commissary General's office?" asked Colonel Davis.

A FORCEFUL REPLY. General Miles leaned forward, drawing his brows to a furrow, and replied forcefully:

"I am not required, sir, to report to the Commissary General."

"Well, did you report it to the Secretary of War," asked Colonel Davis, pleasantly.

General Miles, in reply, went at some length into an explanation of the routine of army headquarters, showing why he preferred to conclude his inquiry so that he might have something tangible to present to the Secretary. Finally he issued his orders to officers to report upon the quality of beef furnished. He did not report directly to the Secretary of War because under a rule of 1890 the order should go from the Adjutant General to the Secretary.

His attacks upon the canned and refrigerated beef before the War Commission were the first, and specifically, Colonel Davis reading testimony of the Commanding General, in which he referred to it as "embalmed" beef, and said it had been sent as "a pretense of experiment."

CANNED BEEF NOT MEAT.

General Miles was asked if he knew when war began that canned roast beef was a part of the army ration. This question brought out a partial explanation of his using the phrase "pretense of experiment." He said he did not know that canned roast beef was a part of the army ration, though in 1888 an order had been issued, including canned, corned or fresh beef. He did not understand the canned beef now in question was meat. When his attention was finally attracted to the canned beef, he declared that "it was being issued as an experiment," since it was not understood by him that canned roast beef was a part of the regular ration.

NO IMPUTATION OF FRAUD.

Continuing this explanation, in answer to a question of Colonel Davis, General Miles said he thought his use of "pretense of experiment" was unfortunate and he disclaimed any intention to impute fraud to anyone.

"So far as imputing fraud," he said, "I wish to state that no inference was intended. It was perhaps an unfortunate expression, and had my attention been called to it I might have amended it to say 'on the theory of an experiment.' As a matter of fact it was an experiment and a very costly one."

THE FIRST COMPLAINTS.

Replying to a question General Miles said he first heard complaints against refrigerated beef at Ponce. The first direct statement that it had been treated chemically came, he believed, from Dr. Daly, who presented it late in September, and appeared subsequently before the War Commission.

He said he did not recollect whether Dr. Daly's report was volunteered or whether he had been ordered to investigate and report on the meat.

It was general talk among the officers at Ponce, General Miles continued, that the refrigerated beef must have been subjected to some chemical treatment to make it keep for seventy-two hours.

CHARACTERIZATION OF ARMY MEAT.

General Miles then read a long summary of 100 letters received by him at army headquarters, giving the various terms in which the army meat was characterized. These included "embalmed," "decomposed," "injected," "poisoned," "spoiled" and the like.

In addition he showed a summary of reports on refrigerated beef condemned and thrown overboard from transports. C. C. Yeamans, from the Yosemite, reported the condemnation of 8,000 pounds; Lieutenant Colonel O'Neil, of the steamship Chester, 4,000 pounds; Colonel James Hamilton Lewis, 10,000 pounds.

Colonel Gillespie took a hand in the inquiry when General Miles finished describing the nauseating qualities of the canned and refrigerator beef.

"Did you, General, ever eat any of this beef?" Colonel Gillespie asked.

"I presume I did, about the time we were at Ponce," said General Miles with some hesitation. "Yes, I presume I did."

"Then," said Colonel Gillespie, "it has not such characteristic qualities as would permit you to detect it off hand?"

"No, sir."

COL. VAN HORNE'S TESTIMONY.

General Miles then left the witness chair and Lieutenant Colonel Van Horne, of the Thirtieth Infantry, was sworn. He said he was at the outbreak of the war major of the Twenty-second Infantry and was through the entire Cuban campaign.

Witness said he had used all kinds, canned, corned, refrigerated and canned roast beef. He said the criticisms of the canned roast beef began early and were made often. It was objected to on the score of its lack of nutriment, its taste and its appearance.

(Continued on Sixth Page.)

LIVELY TIMES IN SPANISH CORTES

A Protest Against Ceding
the Philippines.

THE MINISTRY DENOUNCED

The Galleries Applaud Declaration That the Generals Engaged in the War in Cuba Were Failures—Blanco Accepts Responsibility For Events During His Command—Ordered to Surrender Cuba—Why Santiago Was Attacked.

(By Telegraph to Virginian-Pilot.)

Madrid, Feb. 20.—The Cortes reassembled to-day. The galleries in both chambers were thronged with an expectant crowd. The Senate was very full, hardly a single general being absent.

Senor Montero Rios, president of the Senate, in opening the proceedings, pronounced an eulogy upon M. Faure, and a resolution of condolence with France was adopted unanimously.

Senor Sagasta, the Premier, then proposed to refer the bill providing for the cession of the Philippines to the United States to a special committee, but this the Conservatives protested against, declaring that the bill ought to be conscientiously discussed, and Senor Sagasta withdrew his proposal.

CONDUCT OF GENERALS.

Count d'Almenas then brought up the question of the conduct of the generals engaged in the war in Cuba, declaring that General Primo de Rivera, General Weyler, General Blanco, Admiral Cervera and General Linares had proved failures. This declaration elicited much applause from the public galleries, in consequence of which several of the spectators were expelled from the chamber.

GENERAL UPROAR PROVOKED.

Observing that he would deal with the "shameful capitulation of Santiago," Count d'Almenas asked the house whether he should proceed, and was answered with cries of "yes" and "no," and a general uproar ensued. A repetition of the query provoking still greater tumult, Senor Sagasta rose and defended the government, and its Spanish Peace Commission. The Premier criticised America's "unjustified conduct," and said that everything might be discussed concerning the war, because the cases of the generals were still sub-judice.

A SANGUINARY VIEW.

Count d'Almenas resumed his attack upon the Generals, and complained that "five months had elapsed, and not a single General had been shot." This gave rise to another tumult, and Count d'Almenas was called to order. Again he asked why the Generals who capitulated had not been executed. It is quite true, he declared, that the army is an army of lions, led by asses. Captain General Blanco's administration in Cuba was deplorable, he said, but he was not responsible for the surrender of Santiago.

Reclamations continued between Count d'Almenas and Lieutenant General Correa, the Minister of War, and there was renewed disorder. Then General Primo de Rivera arose and denounced Count d'Almenas as a "contemptible calumniator."

BLANCO ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY.

General Blanco followed, defending the Generals and accepting full responsibility for events in Cuba during his command in the island. General Baroja also denounced Count d'Almenas as a calumniator.

After a promise on the part of Count d'Almenas to produce proofs of his assertions to-morrow the Senate adjourned.

In the Chamber a resolution of condolence with France over the death of President Faure was unanimously adopted.

Senor Silvela, leader of the Dissident Conservatives, moved a vote signifying that the government for accepting the war through fear of the Carlists, and declared that the country was now suffering the consequence of the government's pusillanimity. He proceeded to detail the lack of preparations and of war materials, and charged the government with responsibility for the surrender of Santiago, "which," he declared, "although the garrison there numbered 23,000, and there was sufficient provisions in the place for three months." This declaration created a sensation.

SURRENDER OF CUBA ORDERED.

In proof that the government was responsible for the surrender of Cuba, Senor Annix read telegrams from Senor Sagasta and Lieutenant General Correa to General Blanco, ordering the surrender of Cuba as a means of saving Porto Rico and the Philippines, and preserving order in the peninsula. He also read General Baroja's telegram in reply, opposing the surrender, but agreeing to obey the government's order.

WHY SANTIAGO WAS ATTACKED.

Senor Annix added that President McKinley had telegraphed to General Shafter that the surrender of Santiago had been arranged with the Madrid Government and, therefore, he must make a sort of sham attack.

Captain Aunon, Minister of Marine, interposed at this point, saying he believed this story to be incorrect, whereupon Senor Annix repeated the statement that Premier Sagasta had ordered the surrender of Cuba in order to save the monarchy.